



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/745,808	12/26/2000	Masayuki Terao	Q62445	2609
7590 03/06/2006 SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN, MACPEAK & SEAS 2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, DC 20037			EXAMINER CHAI, LONGBIT	
			ART UNIT 2131	PAPER NUMBER
DATE MAILED: 03/06/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

09/745,808

Applicant(s)

TERAO ET AL.

Examiner

Longbit Chai

Art Unit

2131

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 27 February 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☒ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 6-11.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 1-5 and 12-23,25,26,28-31,33 and 34.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.

CHRISTOPHER REVAK
PRIMARY EXAMINER

3/4/06

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

As per claim 6, Applicant asserts "There is no motivation to modify / reconfigure the simple removable device of Quick to be capable of being inserted into and recognized by an empty PDA cradle assembly of Clark to perform the claimed ID registration". Examiner notes Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but are not persuasive with the following reasons:

The motivation of modifying is really coming from between the primary reference Koike and the 1st secondary reference Quick as well as between the primary reference Koike and the 2nd secondary reference Clark. There is no need to present the modification between 1st secondary reference Quick and the 2nd secondary reference Clark. The detail rationale is listed as follows and Therefore, Applicant's arguments are respectfully traversed.

The primary reference Koike teaches providing an insertion of a removable device into the base communication device (Koike: Figure 4 / Element 24), and both of the 1st secondary reference Quick and the 2nd secondary reference Clark teaches using the portable removable device to integrate with the base device (Quick: Column 1 Line 50 - 53) & (Clark: Figure 1C / Element 49). Therefore, besides the common feature "providing a physical portable removable device" as taught by Quick and Clark, two separate and independent logic features are further needed, which are disclosed by Quick and Clark accordingly - see as follows:

Quick is only relied upon to provide the removable device storing the target ID and subsequently registered / provided into the base device (Quick: see for example, Column 1 Line 53 - 65).

Clark is only relied upon teaching ID stored in the removable device (i.e. a cradle handheld computer assembly with the interface port connected to the host computer) is the same ID (i.e. serial number) as stored in the host computer (Clark: Para [0060] Line 6 - 9 and Para [0010] Line 9 - 12 & Quick: Column 1 Line 50 - 65).

Please refer the FINAL Office action for remarks on claim 9.